

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 20, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 20, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9, 25 and 36 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Interview Summary

On November 20, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between Gero G. McClellan (attorney of record), Johnny Lam (attorney for Applicants), and Examiner Leon Harper. The parties discussed the *Nolan* reference. Claim 9 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 9.

During the interview, Applicants argued that *Nolan* did not teach “wherein selecting any one of the selectable links causes one of the plurality of different applications used to edit the respective data object to be invoked.” The Examiner stated that he was applying a broad interpretation that each data object that may be edited by any of a plurality of different applications. The parties discussed proposed amendments that clarify the relationship between a data object and the respective application for editing the data object. Those amendments are reflected herein. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record, although no allowance was agreed to.

Subsequently, Applicants informally submitted the proposed amendments to the Examiner based on discussions during the interview. After reviewing the proposed amendments, the Examiner telephonically confirmed (also on November 20, 2008) that the proposed amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record, although no allowance was agreed to. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20040205545 (hereinafter *Barger*), in view of US5253362 (*Nolan*).

With this response, Applicants have amended claims 9, 25 and 36 to incorporate the proposed amendments that were discussed with the Examiner during the telephonic interview. Applicants submit that claims 9, 25 and 36, as amended, are not taught by *Barger*, *Nolan*, or any combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to claims 9, 25, 36 and their dependents.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)